



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,172	09/10/2008	Richard Stuart Skipper	156.001US01	7091
34206	7590	05/25/2010	EXAMINER	
FOGG & POWERS LLC 5810 W 78TH STREET SUITE 100 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55439				ROBITAILLE, JOHN P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
05/25/2010			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DAVID@FOGLAW.COM
docketing@fogglaw.com

1. Applicant has advanced three arguments in support of the instant application.

They are:

- a. The different materials employed in the Hammar and Poler teach away from the combination and render the prior art references unsuitable for their intended purpose.
- b. Poler does not teach a “controlled application of physical force”.
- c. Poler’s lenses are attached to each other and not to the sheet.

2. Regarding the first argument, although Hammar employs hydrogels and Poler discloses the use of transparent plastic, the combination does not render either reference unsuitable for its intended purpose, since hydrogels are similarly biologically inert and can be made relatively more or less hard as needed by the specific application. This argument is not persuasive.

3. Regarding the second argument, Poler teaches accelerating ions towards the surface of the film. Since ions are understood to have mass, this meets the limitation claimed. This argument is not persuasive.

4. Regarding the third argument, although Poler regards the lens and haptic structure as parts of an integral whole, it is difficult to consider the haptic structure to be the lens, since it does not perform any of the corrective functions of a lens. This argument is not persuasive.

/Joseph S. Del Sole/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791